

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, June 25, 1975

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the National Farmer's Union meeting and convention at Grande Prairie for Region 8, which reads as follows:

We petition the provincial government, at its present sitting of the Legislature, to consider education as having a priority claim on the heritage fund, and that funding be made available immediately to give true educational equality of opportunity in all regions of Alberta.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Private Bills has had under consideration the undermentioned private bills and begs to report the same with the recommendation that they be proceeded with:

Bill Pr. 3, An Act Respecting Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation;

Bill Pr. 6, An Act to Amend An Act to Incorporate The Canada West Insurance Company.

The Standing Committee on Private Bills has had under consideration the undermentioned private bill and begs to report the same, with the recommendation that it be proceeded with, with an amendment:

Bill Pr. 1, An Act to Amend Certain Settlements Resulting From the Last Will and Testament of the Honourable Patrick Burns.

The Standing Committee on Private Bills begs to recommend with respect to the undermentioned private bill and petition that the fees less the cost of printing be refunded:

Bill Pr. 3, An Act Respecting Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill 214 The Provincial Parks Amendment Act, 1975

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 214, The Provincial Parks Amendment Act, 1975. Mr. Speaker, this bill is in response to a number of senior citizens of my constituency. The intent is to provide free access for senior citizens to our provincial parks, now and in the future.

[Leave being granted, Bill 214 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill 219 The Fire Prevention Amendment Act, 1975

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Fire Prevention Amendment Act, 1975.

Travelling in various parts of the province, Mr. Speaker, I observed that a lot of our hamlets, municipalities, and counties are not adequately protected with fire-fighting equipment to protect the citizens. This bill contains a framework to set up a procedure to protect the citizens of our province.

[Leave being granted, Bill 219 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, perhaps on the last day of the session, to introduce two former members of the Assembly, one in your gallery and one in the public gallery.

First of all, I would like to introduce the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, also the Minister of Public Works for the Province of Alberta in bygone days, Mr. Fred Colborne; secondly, the former Minister of Industry and Tourism for the Province of Alberta, now a school superintendent in Germany, Mr. Raymond Ratzlaff.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, Mrs. Ruby Cutting, who is seated in the Speaker's gallery. Mrs. Cutting is 93 years young. Her late husband, Staff Sergeant Percy Cutting, joined the North West Mounted Police in 1896, serving 28 years to 1924 in the North West Mounted Police, the Royal North West Mounted Police, and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Her son, George, now residing in Calgary, served 28 years with that force and retired 8 years ago. Presently, she has a grandson serving in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Mr. Speaker, she is accompanied by Constable Gordon Chammen of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and I commend her to your care.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, two friends of mine, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Cormack. Bob is a retired botany professor from the University of Alberta, and has contributed a lot of his free time to the environment of this province. I would ask them now to rise and be welcomed by this Assembly.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Alberta Opportunity Company. In addition, I'd like to table responses to Motions for a Return Nos. 184, 108, and 154.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the returns to Orders 114, 146, and 175.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a reply to Order for a Return No. 166, by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, and three copies of a report by Decision Making Information Canada Limited on the Alberta consumer.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a reply to Question No. 172.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table reply to Motion for a Return No. 135, posed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, concerning attendance at the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table three Motions for a Return, Nos. 169, 110, and 125.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to Question 142, required by the Assembly.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Department of Hospitals and Medical Care

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta has received many requests from residents of nursing homes and their families, supported by many members of the Legislative Assembly, to review the nursing home regulations with a view to providing greater flexibility to nursing home residents to visit their families and to take vacation. I am therefore pleased, Mr. Speaker, to announce to members of the Legislature that the Alberta cabinet has approved changes in the nursing home regulations which will provide this needed flexibility.

Previously, residents of nursing homes could only be away under the following rules: 12 consecutive days of extended vacation twice a year; 2 days each week; statutory holidays; 8 days, if hospitalization is required.

Mr. Speaker, the primary concern of many nursing home residents was that they were unable to take extra days over a weekend to visit their families. As well, statutory holidays had to be utilized on the actual date concerned. Mr. Speaker, the new regulations will overcome this difficulty.

Statutory holidays can be taken at any other time. The total extended annual leave has increased from 24 to 28 days. This is in addition to statutory holidays. The 28 days may be utilized in as many individual absences as the resident desires. Absence for required hospitalization has increased from 8 to 15 days. If additional hospitalization days are required, accumulated time may be applied.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members should be made aware that under the former regulations, nursing home residents took a risk of being relocated upon being absent from the nursing home. Under the new regulations, this will not happen. The only consequence will be that the nursing home resident must continue to pay for absence beyond the approved periods.

Mr. Speaker, this means the Province of Alberta will now be providing substantial additional assistance to residents of nursing homes to visit families and for vacation.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Tar Sands -- Foreign Investment

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the Premier. The question flows from the word seeping back from Japan with regard to the federal delegation there speaking to Japanese government and industrialists with regard to Japanese investment in the tar sands.

My question, first of all, is: is the federal delegation talking about investment in additional sites on the Syncrude leases?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'll refer that question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, in the anticipation that he may have some comment to make.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't know what the federal group would have in their minds with regard to negotiations. However, I could say that with regard to any suggestions or discussions they are making which might be construed as being unilateral, they would not in any way bind the Province of Alberta, insofar as the jurisdiction of the province over the tar sands is very clear.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, then, to the minister or the Premier. Were there discussions between the Government of the Province of Alberta and the federal government prior to the federal group going over there, and was the Alberta government apprized of these discussions that Canada was going to have with Japan?

MR. HYNDMAN: To my knowledge, no, there were not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the Alberta government once again to draw to the attention of the federal government who, in fact, really is responsible for tar sands development?

MR. HYNDMAN: I think, Mr. Speaker, that's been made abundantly clear by this province on a number of occasions. I think the federal representatives may well be making submissions with regard to trade between Canada and Japan. Certainly it would be our understanding, and I imagine theirs, that arrangements or discussions they might have which would directly affect the Province of Alberta would always be subject to the agreement of the Province of Alberta.

MR. LUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if I may just supplement the answer by the hon. minister. I believe jurisdiction and ownership position of the Government of Alberta with regard to the oil sands in this province are quite clear and fully recognized in our discussions with the Japanese government over a period of years, particularly arising out of the mission to Japan by the Government of Alberta in September 1972.

AOC Loan -- Drilling Rigs

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. The question flows out of comments the minister made yesterday in dealing with a motion for a return regarding the Kenting drilling rigs.

I'd like to ask the minister if there is any agreement between the Alberta Opportunity Company or the Alberta government and Kenting relating to keeping the rigs in Canada for eight years.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is, yes. There is an agreement with Kenting and the Alberta Opportunity Company that if Kenting desires to move the rigs out of Canada, they must first receive the permission of the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the minister recall the answer he gave in the House, I believe within the last two weeks, when he indicated that the rigs must remain in Canada during the eight year pay-back period?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, that is true, unless the Alberta Opportunity Company explicitly permits the rigs to be removed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is this agreement filed at the companies branch?

MR. DOWLING: Would you ask again?

MR. CLARK: Is the agreement between the Alberta Opportunity Company and Kenting filed at the companies branch? Frankly, I ask the question because we've checked there, and there is nothing to indicate they have to get approval from the Opportunity Company after two years.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the agreement is not filed with the companies branch. However, the debentures relative to that agreement are.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the comment the minister made some time ago and his revelation today, would the minister be prepared to table or make available to members of the Assembly that particular portion of the agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: If the debenture has, as is required, been filed in the companies branch, it would be a matter of public record.

MR. CLARK: It isn't. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister prepared to make available to members of the Assembly the portion of the agreement that says Kenting must get approval from the Alberta Opportunity Company prior to moving rigs out of Canada?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the response to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition was filed just a few moments ago in one of the returns I made.

Gasoline Excise Tax

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In light of the announcement in the federal budget of the 10-cent excise tax, and the increase in the price of oil, I was wondering if the Provincial Treasurer has had time to interpret the budget to the extent that he could make a statement on what it says about transportation allowances.

Would he know if the transportation allowances are involved with county school buses as well as the school division-owned buses? These people will be going for contracts shortly, if they're not dealing now, and it will make a great difference to what it is going to cost for transportation in education.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, on my interpretation of the wording in the Minister of Finance's budget speech, the tax which I believe the hon. member is referring to would not be applicable to vehicles used as school buses. But I do want to put the caveat on that, that it wouldn't be until we saw either the legislation or regulations that one could form a final opinion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In light of widespread concern about the application of rebates under the new excise tax, has the Department of the Treasury been able to determine yet from the federal government the ground rules for rebates under the excise tax; where people will apply, and what the process of application will be?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker, we haven't. At least, I haven't received a report on it yet. I would suspect that information would be readily available from the federal department.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government aware that at this time there seems to be a complete lack of policy from the federal government on this matter, and that there is no mechanism . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is volunteering information.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further supplementary question on this matter to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether the excise tax is applicable to stocks of gasoline already on hand, or to new deliveries from the refinery?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for a legal interpretation. Unless in some way the matter can be related to the official duties of the minister, it couldn't be the proper subject of a question during the Question Period.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase the question to the hon. minister. Has the Department of Consumer Affairs monitored the new excise tax rebate scheme to determine in what way it is applicable?

MR. HARLE: I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is well able to monitor the implications of its tax.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Has the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs received any reports that commercial outlets are already charging the 10-cent excise tax?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, again I must say that it's the federal government's tax. It's not the responsibility of the Government of the Province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is it the intention of the Government of Alberta to make representation to Ottawa that administration of the excise tax be on the basis of new oil supplied from the refineries rather than existing stocks on hand?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, that matter perhaps again should be referred to the federal government.

Mackenzie Valley Pipeline

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think my question should be directed to the Premier. It concerns general provincial policy with respect to arctic gas. At the moment, two applications for the transmission of arctic gas are before the National Energy Board, namely, the Maple Leaf pipeline and the Canadian Arctic Gas pipeline.

Has the government arrived at a position in support of either pipeline?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my recollection, in responding to a somewhat similar question last fall, is that the position of the Government of Alberta is that the feasibility of the pipelines proposing to take natural gas from the Mackenzie Delta is a matter of the jurisdiction of the National Energy Board before appropriate hearings, which hearings are only in the preliminary stages. We don't think it would be appropriate for the Alberta government to take a specific position with regard to the two competing applications at this time, although that position is subject to reconsideration.

We are, however, inclined to a preference toward the Maple Leaf Project, as developed by the Alberta Gas Trunk Line, because we understand it would more extensively use the existing Alberta facilities of transmission and existing Alberta facilities generally, and I believe too, would reflect support for a company under charter by law of the Province of Alberta.

Gasoline Excise Tax (continued)

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Has the government made any estimate of what it would cost the Government of Alberta to pick up the 10-cent excise tax for pleasure driving for residents of the Province of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer feel it would be advisable to pick up the excise tax for pleasure driving in the Province of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is asking for an opinion, which perhaps might be sought otherwise.

Rural Gas Program

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. What is the government's position in providing grants to private utility companies for rural gas installation?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the rural gas program can go forward in a number of ways -- four basic ways, as a matter of fact. One of those is through a support mechanism that involves the construction and operation of these rural gas operations by private utilities. This is a matter of the choices of the areas. So the program, as it stands, can apply in the situation the hon. member described, just as it applies to the rural gas co-op situations where the co-operatives themselves do all the operations.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, for clarification. Could the minister indicate if there is any difference in the grant structure between the private utility companies and the co-ops?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I'd be hesitant to say there are no differences at all, inasmuch as there may be some differences in detail. But the policy substance of the rural gas program and the undertaking to serve gas to rural Alberta is the same in either instance.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Some of the private utility companies have established contracts, in my area for example, at \$575, and now installation has increased to \$2,750.

Will any consideration be given in this area, since the policy has been changed?

DR. WARRACK: I'm not sure what the hon. member meant when he said, "since the policy has been changed". In any case, he's obviously thinking of an important instance in his constituency. I think I would like to look into it. If he would help me with the information I would need to do that, I would certainly undertake to look into the matter.

Heritage Trust Fund

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In light of the minister's statement to the Canadian Medical Association with regard to the use of the Alberta heritage fund to fund medical research, could the minister elaborate as to what he means by a reasonable amount of the heritage fund being used?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is probably referring to an article in the paper quoting me at the Canadian Medical Association convention. I was not nearly as direct or positive. I was saying this was something we could examine as a possible area for devotion of some of Alberta heritage savings trust funds, and did not make a definite commitment either to amount or, in fact, that we would, but that this was something perhaps worthy of further consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What type of professional manpower and physical facilities for medical research did the minister have in mind?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is probably referring to the statement, also reported in the article, in which I referred to the fact that in Alberta, as hon. members know, we are leading in certain medical areas, notably some procedures at the University Hospital and the Foothills Hospital. My remarks to the Canadian Medical Association were that the upgrading of these areas perhaps could fit the parameters of the heritage savings trust fund, as well as new potential medical research areas.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier, as a matter for clarification. I find a number of ministers either flying kites or making announcements with regard to the heritage fund.

What other programs or announcements, if any, are being prepared for the summer . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: All kinds of them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . with regard to the heritage fund?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, with regard to that matter, the ministers, in the nature of their responsibilities, are attempting to base their remarks on the statement, an appendix to the budget speech, that I made in Red Deer on March 12 this year regarding parameters and possible terms of reference for the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. It's hoped that during the course of summer months, some progress may be made in terms of being more definitive with regard to these matters, but we are welcoming the natural public debate that occurs on this very important subject, both within the Legislature and outside.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the members of the Legislature have a commitment from the Premier that no further announcements or commitments will be made until we pass the legislation in the fall, so we have a legal vehicle?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is well aware that a commitment made by the government to invest the Alberta heritage savings trust fund in any particular area is subject to the ratification of the Legislature and the due processes of law.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is it still the government's intention to bring in the necessary legislation on the heritage trust fund during the fall session, or has there been any consideration about delaying that legislation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's the target, but past experience has shown the complexities of legislation in a number of areas are such that that target may not be met, that it may be the spring of 1976.

Law Enforcement Grants

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I would address this question to the hon. Solicitor General. As the grant program for law enforcement for the cities of Calgary and Edmonton appears to be on the basis of two policemen per thousand of population, is it a requirement that these cities attain this ratio before qualifying for that grant?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, no. The grants are unconditional, and the formula which establishes the ratio of citizens to constables is a guideline. It is the hope, since that is obviously indicated as an adequate standard of policing, that there will be an attempt by local police commissions to reach that ratio.

MR. LITTLE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister inform the House how this ratio of two policemen per thousand compares with the national ratio?

MR. FARRAN: I'm afraid I haven't got the figures at my fingertips for the national police forces right across the country. I'll obtain that information for the hon. member and communicate with him directly.

Petroleum Exploration Plan

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and ask whether, in light of the recent federal budget, the government plans any modifications, changes, or adjustments in ALPEP.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the basic intent and thrust of the plan will not be changed. There may be modifications to dovetail into the changes in the budget, but the basic components of the plan would not change.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government set any target date for announcing the modifications in ALPEP?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member shouldn't misread my comments about modifications. It would only be in the legislation the government would have to provide in order to make the plan effective in the manner it was prior to the federal budget. The hon. member would see that in legislation.

Calgary General Hospital

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Not so long ago, the provincial government was interested in buying the General Hospital in Calgary.

I wonder if the minister is in a position to advise the House if the provincial government is, in fact, making any arrangements for purchasing the General Hospital in Calgary.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member is referring to the approach by the City of Calgary with respect to the Calgary General, or the approach by the federal government with respect to the Col. Belcher.

MR. KUSHNER: I'm referring to the General Hospital in Calgary.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, in my view they are two different issues. While the City of Calgary, through the mayor, has requested that we examine the possibility of purchasing the Calgary General Hospital, that would not provide additional beds in the hospital system. We have it under consideration, but various things have to be taken into consideration in connection with that particular request.

Grain Shipments

MR. TAYLOR: My question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister any comments on the slump in grain exports from Vancouver?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is seeking information which is in the possession of the department, perhaps the question could be put in that form. But if he wants a market opinion, that could perhaps be sought outside the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask the economics branch.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question. In view of the slump in the export of grain from Vancouver harbor, is the Department of Agriculture taking any steps to try to correct this?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the slump, in the hon. member's opinion, regarding grain exports from Vancouver may not be an overall slump over the course of several months but is related partly to the labor stoppages that occurred at the port during the course of the last several months, and partly to the quality of grain available in the prairie region during the last crop year. As hon. members might know, much of the feed grain available was of a lower quality and is being shipped through Thunder Bay rather than Vancouver, because of its destination to a different market.

It is difficult for us in Alberta to determine exactly what the future holds for grain shipments, because of the unavailability of Canadian Wheat Board future sales commitments, and the unavailability of world supplies of feed grains and wheat which relate very definitely to weather conditions and the purchasing power of countries in need.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Are any steps being taken to correct the alleged poor condition of grain reaching the Vancouver harbor?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, because of frost last August in this province and in Saskatchewan, much of the grain shipped to the elevator system, for instance barley, graded no. 3 or lower. Our wheat grades were certainly lower than normal too. I'm not aware that there are any other difficulties in the condition of grain reaching Vancouver, which occurred between the country elevator system in Alberta and the Vancouver ports.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary. Has any progress been made towards drying and cleaning our grain in Alberta before it's shipped to Vancouver?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I think it's fair to say the position of the Government of Alberta, since August 1971, has been that we ought to improve and add value to our products, not only by drying but by cleaning them in this province.

As hon. members would be aware, the Palliser Wheat Growers Association, the Government of Alberta, and others have been involved pretty actively in studies that would lead to development of a grain handling system that didn't have the present dependence on grain drying, cleaning, and grading in the ports, but rather that we do that in Alberta.

In addition, we've been able to move in a number of areas. Two of the most important are rapeseed crushing, wherein rather than sending the rapeseed uncleaned, and perhaps undried, to the ports in Vancouver, two crushing plants are now under construction where the product will not only be cleaned, but will be processed into oil and meal, and shipped to Vancouver and other points as a finished product.

Hon. members should also be aware, Mr. Speaker, that we've been working very aggressively to try to interest and develop additional malt plants in Alberta. We look to the future in terms of processing perhaps as much as five to ten million bushels of additional malting barley in this province, which would result in the same situation I've mentioned with regard to rapeseed.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Will the laying off of men and the reduction of ships now being loaded at the Vancouver harbor not hurt our credibility as a grain producer and seller in the markets of the world?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the hon. member is asking a question which could certainly lead to debate, and on which other hon. members might wish to express opinions on another occasion.

MR. TAYLOR: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I'm not trying to debate. Shipments of grain from Vancouver have a vital effect on prairie grain growers. I would think laying men off and reducing the number of ships in Vancouver would hurt our credibility as a seller and may hurt our production of grain over the next several years, which is very serious.

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, and acknowledging the great importance of the question, it would appear that the question is directed to asking the hon. minister to make a prediction, which really would not fit in with his official functions as far as the Question Period is concerned.

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is his department encouraging the building of inland terminals to speed up the delivery of grain to Vancouver, as has taken place at Weyburn, Saskatchewan?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no. We're not yet in a position to encourage the building of inland terminals. Hon. members should be aware that a new commission, headed by Mr. Justice Hall I believe, is preparing to hold hearings across this province, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba during the course of the next year, relative to rail line abandonment, inland cleaning, inland terminals, and that type of thing.

We're not yet in a position, from a provincial point of view, to suggest or recommend that we should depart from the existing country elevator grain-handling system. Indeed, it's been stated before in this Legislature that probably the country elevator handling system is not the biggest problem in the movement and transportation of grain, but rather the rail system and the continual tie-up, which the hon. Member for Drumheller referred to, at the west coast ports.

AOC Loan -- Drilling Rigs (continued)

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go back to the question with regard to AOC loans and drilling rigs. Perhaps I might be permitted [to give] a very brief background. On June 17, the minister indicated that the number of years of the pay-out of the loan is eight, and that is the length of time the rigs in question are to remain in Canada.

In light of his motion for a return tabled today in which it says "subsequent to the terms of agreement with A.O.C.", I'd like to ask the minister when these additional conditions were placed on the arrangements between AOC and Kenting Drilling.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the information tabled today in Motion for a Return No. 184 enumerates the conditions fairly clearly. I should also say it is my understanding that the policy of the Alberta Opportunity Company is not to consent to the removal of the rigs during the entire life of this loan.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister then. That being the case, why wasn't that included in the material filed at the companies branch, so creditors would have public information?

MR. DOWLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not about to go down and tell Mr. Clarke exactly the detail of how he should run his operation. I think the policy is clear, and I've already told the hon. Leader of the Opposition the policy.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Could the minister tell us where this subsequent agreement is lodged now? Is it lodged with the Alberta Opportunity Company, the minister's office, or where?

MR. DOWLING: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the agreement is with the Alberta Opportunity Company and would be in their files.

MR. CLARK: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the minister to ask the Alberta Opportunity Company, in fact, to file that with the companies branch to

prevent other potential creditors from gaining priority over the investment of the people of the Province of Alberta?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the arrangements regarding the loan are that the debentures are secured by a first specific charge in the seven drilling rigs and the personal guarantee of Kenting Limited for the full amount of the indebtedness.

Gasoline Excise Tax (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier, and ask whether the Government of Alberta has come to the conclusion that they would rule out shielding Albertans as a result of the 10-cent excise tax, or whether this matter is under consideration.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the position of the Government of Alberta is that the excise tax is a tax of the federal government, just the same way as the federal government establishes a tax in any other area. It would not be our intention to respond in any way to that particular tax. What we will look at is the question of the increased cost to the Alberta consumer, which arises out of the increase in the price at the wellhead.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Does the Government of Alberta consider that ALPEP in fact sets a precedent for shielding Albertans as a result of federal taxation?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that of course is a debatable approach. Our view is no. Because there, we were essentially involved in the establishment by the Alberta government initially in a royalty rate structure. Subsequent taxation by the federal government altered the position relative to that royalty rate structure and required us to move as we did, on December 12, 1974, to strengthen an industry that was in fact threatened by very unfortunate moves of the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister received any indication of price increases in the compact car field as a result of the 10-cent per gallon excise tax on gasoline?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not aware of anything of that nature.

AOC Loan -- Drilling Rigs (continued)

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Business Development and Tourism once again. In light of the minister's answer that it's not the intention of the Alberta Opportunity Company to let their rigs go outside of Canada, I'd like to ask the minister why, in the agreement between Kenting Limited and the Opportunity Company, it says, removal of "any of the mortgaged premises from Canada prior to June 30, 1977", if, in fact, it's the intention of the Opportunity Company and the government not to let the rigs go outside the country for eight years.

MR. SPEAKER: Without wanting to be unduly obtrusive in the Question Period, it does seem we're practically generating a debate on the terms of an agreement. I don't know whether the Question Period is a suitable occasion for generating that kind of debate or that kind of information. But perhaps if the question can be answered briefly, the hon. minister might wish to answer it.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, as a subsequent document to the original negotiated terms between Kenting Limited and the Opportunity Company, an attachment was made that additional terms were required, which indicate that the rigs would not leave Canada without the express permission of the Alberta Opportunity Company. I have just said, a few moments ago, that the policy of the Opportunity Company is not to consent to the removal of the rigs during the entire period of the loan.

Television Service, Slave Lake

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, just before the question period concludes, last week when I was not present in the House, the hon. Leader of the Opposition did pose a question to the Premier with reference to television in northern Alberta areas. This is a matter I have also had the opportunity to discuss with the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake. The question had to do with what activities were under way, and what progress was being made with respect to this matter, and more particularly if discussions occurred with CFRN TV and any members of the government, particularly pertaining to Slave Lake.

I can report, Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions with respect to the hope of improving the television service at Slave Lake. There had been discussions with CBC by my predecessor. Of course, any such licensing for CBC to improve its television broadcasting into Slave Lake would flow through CRTC of the federal government. I understand this is contemplated for 1977.

I understand further that my predecessor, the Hon. Roy Farran, and the Deputy Premier have discussed this matter with CFRN TV, and have taken the matter under advisement and are doing a review of the situation at the present time.

MR. CLARK: Supplementary to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. In the course of his discussion with various members of the government, did the minister discuss the commitment the Deputy Premier made in Slave Lake during the course of the election campaign?

DR. WARRACK: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that during the very effective campaign conducted in that constituency in March 1975, that matter was brought up by the hon. member who has now taken his place in this Assembly, and by the Deputy Premier. They undertook to look into the matter as to possible options to improve television service in that important community.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister. Is it the position of the Government of Alberta that a commitment has been made to the good people in Slave Lake? Will the Alberta government see that their television reception and choice of channels are, in fact, improved?

DR. WARRACK: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a legitimate aspiration of people in any community and of this government, which is responsive to those aspirations. If that is wanted and needed, we're prepared to review the matter and assess what ways there might be to achieve that improvement.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would the minister be in a position to explain to the Assembly, and I'm sure the people of Slave Lake, why he has backed off the commitment given by the Deputy Premier in Slave Lake?

MR. NOTLEY: After the election.

DR. WARRACK: My understanding of the situation, Mr. Speaker, is that no backing-off has been done. We are proceeding according to the discussions held during that most effective campaign.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. What target is the minister shooting at to fulfil this commitment? Let's have some action in a specific direction.

MR. NOTLEY: One month before the next election.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister care to indicate when discussions were held with CFRN television? Is it true they were held after the election, after the commitment was made?

DR. WARRACK: Some of these discussions might very well have occurred within that time frame. That would seem quite logical to me.

MR. CLARK: Then would the minister be in a position to give his assurance to the Assembly that discussions with CFRN were held prior to the commitment made in Slave Lake by the Deputy Premier?

DR. WARRACK: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I already answered that question when I indicated that my predecessor, the Hon. Roy Farran, in his capacity as minister prior to the election of March 16, 1975, in which we all happily participated, had some of those discussions. I believe I indicated that in my initial answer.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. I wouldn't want to misconstrue the minister's answer at all.

[laughter]

Just so everyone clearly understands what the minister says in his usual concise manner . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed. Agreed.

MR. CLARK: . . . is it true that officials of the Government of Alberta had discussions with CFRN officials prior to the commitment made in Slave Lake by the Deputy Premier?

DR. WARRACK: The hon. member keeps using the term commitment, and of course, I've acknowledged that commitment to look into the matter of improved television service in that important, growing, and prosperous community. In that regard, it is quite correct

that officials had had such discussions with the people the hon. leader of the Opposition mentioned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Got another one?

MR. CLARK: [Inaudible] end the session.

Farm Fuel Rebate Program

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, if we still have some time in the Question Period, I'd like to respond to two questions asked of me earlier this week, which I said I'd look into.

MR. SPEAKER: As a matter of fact, we're out of time. But with the leave of the Assembly, perhaps the hon. minister might . . .

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LEITCH: The first question, Mr. Speaker, was from the hon. Member for Bow Valley. He asked whether the Treasury Department would be prepared to share in the administration of the federal farm fuel rebate program. Mr. Speaker, the short answer to that is, yes. But I should add that we have not been asked to participate. If we are, we'll be very pleased to co-operate.

Treasury Branches -- Resource Development

MR. LEITCH: The second question, Mr. Speaker, asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition, dealt with whether an oil and gas department had been established within the treasury branches. The question of whether to establish such a department is under consideration, but no decision has yet been made.

I should amplify on that answer, Mr. Speaker, by commenting on the policy of the treasury branches. We are, of course, limited in our capacity to expand programs by personnel and by the deposit rate base. The fundamental policy of the treasury branches has been to expand services into areas where other financial institutions, particularly lending institutions, are not providing the level of service we think should be provided. That is primarily in the rural area, dealing with small businesses and certain housing programs.

During the past 3 years, there's been very massive expansion in those areas, with some 7 new loan programs initiated by the treasury branch alone, including the home improvement loan program, the mobile home program, and programs of that nature. In addition, treasury branches have become approved lenders with respect to 10 different farm lending programs. The expansion in that area has been very substantial, Mr. Speaker, and we're very proud of the level of service they've been able to give. In fact, services more than doubled, as I recall, in the last 3 years.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave of the Assembly to revert to Tabling Returns and Reports?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS (reversion)

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Question No. 104, asked by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands revert to Introduction of Visitors?

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (reversion)

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the House for their indulgence. I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a guest of the Legislature this afternoon, who is seated in your gallery. Mr. Heward Grafftey is a member of the federal House of Commons and represents the Quebec constituency of Brome-

Missisquici, which he has represented federally since 1958, with the exception of a sabbatical he took, I think, between 1968 and 1972.

He's on a tour across the country. I sincerely hope and expect he will be able to report to his colleagues and constituents that the biology and psychology of people in western Canada are the same as those of the people in eastern Canada.

I would ask Mr. Grafftey to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. HANSEN: I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the House, Colonel Steve Gulyas, our commanding officer from the Cold Lake air base in my constituency. I would like him to rise and be recognized by the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

Bill 35 The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975

MR. CLARK: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Government House Leader if it's the government's intention to bring in any amendments to this bill during the committee work?

MR. HYNDMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I understand the amendment which has been prepared has been circulated. It's one page, dated June 25, and relates to two minor points. One, it clears up the designation and the formal nomenclature of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, the meeting of a branch or branches. Secondly, it clears up and further clarifies, with regard to Section 3(b), the intention of the bill and the first section, by striking out the words "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act".

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, then I would like to move an amendment to Bill 35, really dealing with Section 3. The basis of this amendment, frankly, is that it would strike out the words "any fees", so that in fact if the government is, shall I say, hellbent on going in this particular direction, at least members of the Assembly who would be on these boards and agencies would get their travelling expenses, but that would be it. There would be no doubling up on MLA salaries and fees for services on committees.

I would like to propose that Section 3 is amended: (2) a by striking out the words "any fees or cf", "fees or" and subclause (i); also in section (b), as to the proposed subsection (2)b, by striking out the words of "of fees . . ." and subclause (i) thereof. I have copies.

The real operational portion of it is that it strikes from the act any fees that would be made available to members of the Assembly who accept these appointments.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, in speaking to the amendment, I think this would be a very questionable, and indeed, a very unwise move in the sense that if we are going to provide a closer link between citizens of the province and their elected members, to require and make eligible members of the Legislative Assembly to sit on statutory boards and in effect to demand of them a substantial contribution of time, effort, and energy; then to follow

that by denying them totally, or denying any discretion with regard to the fees they might be paid, would be very, very unwise. Certainly, the number of hours that could be spent by a given MLA in a given year with regard to his services on a board could range well into the hundreds. I think it would be very unwise, and certainly unfair, for the Assembly to say that MLA should totally donate those services under that circumstance. So I'd urge the amendment be defeated, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment, I certainly can't agree with the remarks the Government House Leader has made.

We are talking in terms of the fees to be eliminated. Fees can vary from \$10 to \$200 per day, depending upon the profession or the sacrifice that particular member is making. The point can also be made that the amount given in fees could be any amount relative to the type of association that member has with cabinet, the type of personal or any other kind of relationship. I think it lends itself to total abuse.

Maybe we have responsible men as cabinet ministers in this legislature who are going to monitor this, to look after it. But one of the things I learned early in my career as a cabinet minister -- and it comes home to me more than ever at this point in time, when I stand in my position here -- is that any law you make isn't a law for 1, 2, or 4 years. It's law for 10, 15, 20 years, forever after.

AN HCN. MEMBER: Until it's changed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: And sometimes it takes years and years to get it off the law books.

I'm sure if we talked to new members of this Assembly, when they come in they feel whatever ground rules they came into the game with have been established for many, many years. That's the way an operation takes place. That's the way it is. I recall that when I first came in we didn't have offices. I said, well, that's the way it is. I accepted that fact. But when you come in and have access to a lot of government funds, a lot of secretarial help, all kinds of assistance, you think that's the way things are. We're creating that kind of situation through this legislation.

I disagree with the legislation in total. But we are attempting in some way to be responsible on a long-term basis. I'm sure that five years from now that front row isn't going to look like it does today. Getty will have a couple of gray hairs.

AN HCN. MEMBER: He's got them already.

MR. R. SPEAKER: But it will just not be the same, not the same people.

MR. NOTLEY: The back bench will.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's right. The back bench will be the same. That's correct. Still waiting, still anxious, still eager. The only dribbles they get -- we hope they're only dribbles -- are what come through this particular legislation. The way it's set up, the fees, with no control, no guidelines, can be handed out in a totally irresponsible manner. I think the time to check that kind of thing is when you pass the legislation, establish that particular thing.

We're prepared to say some of the daily living costs a person has can be paid. But beyond that, we do not support any kind of moneys made available through fees. I think that a government passing this kind of legislation, supporting it, is certainly overlooking the responsibility it has, not only today, but in 5, 10, and 15 years, or when they're not members of this Assembly.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. As has already been pointed out, the amendment would make provision for the living and travel expenses of members who serve on these various boards. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, one of the arguments -- and again I recall the report of the Camp Commission, and one of the arguments we've heard, not just in this legislature, but as one gleans the newspapers in this province -- is that you get yourself into a rather serious situation when you have MLAs meddling in the administration of these boards. One way to make sure there's no meddling is to ensure that any representation of MLAs on boards is on a voluntary basis, that their living expenses are looked after, but they don't receive fees and commissions.

Like the Member for Little Bow, I have some serious doubts about the principle of Bill 35. If we're going to have people sitting on these boards, whether it be the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, the Alberta Energy Company, or the Syncrude board, it seems to me that, while their expenses could be picked up, they should not in fact be receiving fees and commissions.

If one makes fees and commissions available, it is inevitably going to happen that these members will become more and more and more immersed in the activities of their boards. They'll be confusing their roles as overall policymakers with day to day administrative problems of the particular board they happen to be represented on. I feel this amendment, while it's not going to solve all the problems I see in this bill, nonetheless would at least mitigate the problem of MLAs becoming deeply involved in the administration of the boards they are appointed to. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, we would accept the amendment.

I recall our discussing the changes to the Hospital Services Commission in 1972. My, how things change. At that time we had a debate, and if I recollect that occasion, the

suggestion was made that MLAs were going to sit on the commission but there wouldn't be any salary or remuneration. Now we have ourselves in a situation where there are going to be fees, where an MLA could indeed make as much or more working on a commission board as he or she makes as a member of the Legislative Assembly. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, that's the wrong way to go about it.

I come back to a point I made before. If the government feels there's talent on the back bench which they want to train for future cabinet roles, let them bring in ministerial assistants who are responsible along with the minister for a specific department accountable to this Legislature. But, Mr. Chairman, to pay people to sit on commissions so they become mixed up in the administration, but not directly accountable to this Legislature, in my view is just the wrong course to follow.

I would hope we would support this amendment. I think it's reasonable and would go at least part of the way to resolve some of the difficulties. Not only in the Legislature, Mr. Chairman, but throughout the Province of Alberta, I think people are concerned about this bill, about the moonlighting of MLAs on government boards and agencies. I believe that if this amendment were passed, there would be at least some move by this Legislature to accommodate that concern and to go part of the way to resolve some of the concerns people have about this bill.

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little surprised at this amendment coming from the hon. member, because I seem to recall him always speaking out very strongly against discrimination, particularly against women. I also seem to recall him speaking out against discrimination in other areas, and certainly talking about equal pay for equal work and this type of thing. Therefore, it's a little surprising that he now feels MLAs should be discriminated against. I guess they're a sort of second class citizen. [interjections] Because he is considered capable and fit to work on a board, he should, nevertheless, not receive the same remuneration as a member of the board for doing the work of a board member.

On that side, they do keep emphasizing, you know, that this is a terrific opportunity for indiscriminate handing out of vast sums of money to MLAs. This, really, is very irresponsible. After all, I'm sure the cabinet is a responsible cabinet. They suggest that, of course, they're sure they're responsible. But they don't know if, in a couple of years time, or in five years time, we are going to have such a thing as a responsible cabinet. It would seem to me that the people of this province definitely had a feeling that we did have a responsible government. I get that general impression. Therefore, I would question their attitude that it is a completely irresponsible government, and in fact, is going to pork barrel, and here's a great opportunity to hand out vast sums. All that is being asked for in this bill is that a person who does a job gets paid for doing the job. I mean, it's very nice to get volunteers who will work for nothing. I think most of our people who are asked to work for nothing, where other people are doing the same job and being paid for it, usually don't give quite as good a standard of work.

Therefore, I think the proposal of this amendment is discriminatory, and I am personally against discrimination of this type.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I really must rise to make just a comment or two. I can see that we're going to have a backbenchers' liberation organization that will, I am sure, probably stand as a much more frightening thing than women's liberation or any of the other liberation groups going hellbent for leather these days.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I just can't accept that argument at all. Nobody twisted our arms to run. We sought public office voluntarily. As a consequence, it seems to me we have to be prepared to accept some of the responsibilities which go along with public office.

The idea, Mr. Chairman, that you can't get anything done unless you pay for it, or that the quality of service is not going to be as good if members don't get paid, says some awfully dreadful things about that particular hon. member's view of the rest of us. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, quite clearly, we've heard over and over again from this government about the virtues of voluntary service. That's right; [there are] tremendous virtues in developing voluntary service. But are we to suggest that the line on voluntary service stops when it comes to MLAs; that if MLAs are going to serve on commissions or boards, we have to get paid not only for subsistence, but whatever the fees and commissions, whatever the going rates are, or our quality of service won't be so hot? Mr. Chairman, I just say, with great respect to our hon. members, that that is the kind of argument which does the government's Bill 35 more disservice than anything we can say on this side of the House.

I would simply suggest to the Government House Leader that in the interests of defending Bill 35, perhaps he make sure that he handles it right from this point on, if that's going to be the course taken.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is a very simple, straightforward one. I think it's consistent with what the government has said many times about voluntary service. Mr. Chairman, for us to argue the need for fees and commissions when we have just passed a resolution setting up a committee which is going to review salaries and benefits is simply going to be ridiculed from one end of the province to the other. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that one way to deal with this is to show we are concerned about voluntary contributions, and as a result say quite clearly that MLAs are going to serve because they have something to say, because they're willing to serve the public interest and don't have to be paid fees and commissions to do so.

MR. KING: Mr. Chairman, the hon. members opposite have raised some interesting points, and could perhaps instruct me. A good deal was made in recent debate about the recommendations of the Camp Commission report on the Legislature, as it applied to this practice in Ontario. Now, one of the things you have to understand about the Camp Commission is their very basic premise that the job of an MPP is a full-time one. In fact, in criticizing this practice, they say as much. Their criticism is predicated upon the belief of all three members of the commission.

[interjections]

I've got it right in front of me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then read it.

MR. KING: Right. Okay. "The idea that the job of an MPP is a full-time one" -- I'm reading from the Camp Commission report -- "predicated upon the assumption that the job of an MPP is a full-time one . . ." They recommended in 1972 or 1973 that the salary of an MPP in Ontario should be \$28,000 a year, plus allowances.

If we go to the west of us, the NDF government of British Columbia, by a very simple expedient, even managed to avoid bringing the question to the Legislature. They simply called two sessions a year in order to get two sessional indemnities and doubled their salary from \$12,000 to \$24,000.

[interjections]

Now, I'm not going to argue the merits, or otherwise, of that. Mr. Barrett said at the time, I believe, that he considered the job of an MLA in British Columbia to be a full-time one. He therefore thought, in 1972, that an NDP MLA who was doing a full-time job should get \$24,000 a year, which I think is up to \$30,000 a year now, if I'm not mistaken.

So, one of the important questions to be resolved is whether or not our argument for or against this bill is based upon our belief that the job of an MLA should or should not be a full-time job. I'd be interested in hearing from the hon. members opposite whether they believe that the job of an MLA should be a full-time one. Whether they believe it or not, it's going to have some considerable influence on the weight I attach to their argument. So if I could hear from them, I'd be very interested.

[interjections]

That it should be.

MR. NOTLEY: It is.

MR. KING: It should be a full-time job.

[interjections]

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Chairman, I've been listening to the discussion on Bill 35 with keen interest, particularly the comments made by the hon. Member for Little Bow, who mentioned that effective legislation is felt over many, many years.

I'd like to draw to the attention of this Assembly the fact that in 1965, it was necessary to call a special committee to look at administrative boards and tribunals as a result of the action of the previous government. It's interesting to note, I have the report in my hand, that as a result of the kind of thing heard at the public hearings, the people of Alberta were concerned about the lack of input by the citizens on these boards and commissions. Allowing elected representatives to sit on these boards would certainly be useful.

MR. HORSMAN: One question I might like to ask the mover of the amendment is whether he proposed an amendment to Section 4 of the bill. He went through it so quickly, I wasn't aware whether he had or not. Apparently he hadn't proposed an amendment to that section, which also refers to fees. I suggest it's because he didn't read that section, which indicates that the Provincial Treasurer shall report the names of each board, commission, or other body referred to in subsection (1), and the amount paid in the fiscal year by the government as fees, that is, travelling and living expenses under the section.

I suggest some of the concern expressed by the hon. members of the opposition on this question arises from not having read that section to see that it is the full intention of this government to report annually on this whole situation. I would hope that they will now read it.

I had anticipated some sparkling debate on this issue from the members of the opposition because that's what I'd read in the newspaper over the weekend. How disappointed I was to find they had embraced Dalton Camp. I suggest to the hon. members that [if] they embrace that person, they do so with a great deal of caution.

MR. CLARK: It's [inaudible] experience if they keep their place.

MR. HORSMAN: That's right. I think we can learn from the experience of others, and I suggest to the hon. members that they approach that particular person with great care before they embrace him, his theories or his philosophies.

May I say this, however. I had not intended to participate in this debate because, hearing the remarks today -- initially at any rate -- there was a considerable moderation of the terminology which had been used to describe this bill. However, as the hon. members of the opposition became more heated, they started to throw out these words again. This bothers me a great deal. To my knowledge, there has never been a tradition in this

province, Mr. Chairman, of having abused the Legislative privileges. This goes back over many years to the previous administration. I think that's one of the reasons they stayed in power for 35 years.

DR. BUCK: They stayed out of pork barrelling.

MR. HORSMAN: There we go again with that terminology. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the use of this terminology is demeaning to the members of this House. I do not think it is proper to suggest such motives to the government in introduction of this bill. Personally, as a member who is new in the House, I came here fully prepared to serve the people I represent. I did not come here to get into any trough or pork barrel, or to moonlight. But I do believe that if I'm asked to assume extra responsibilities, additional pay for those responsibilities is not cut of order.

I thought the hon. Member for Macleod made a very good point the other day. Why is the Leader of the Opposition paid an additional amount, over and above his sessional indemnity? It is because he is asked to assume extra responsibility. I've heard reports to the effect that the members of the Social Credit Party are splitting that fee. I may be wrong. I read it in the newspaper, however. If that is the case, that's their privilege. I would ask why. Obviously, it is because they are assuming extra responsibility because of their size. I won't quarrel with that for one moment. They may be weak in number, but I had anticipated they would be strong in ideas and debate. This debate has not proved that to be the case.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, just one comment with regard to the comments from my learned friend from Medicine Hat. In proposing this amendment, we had sufficient confidence in the Attorney General that if no fees were paid, he wouldn't include any in his report to the Assembly. That seems a rather accepted legal approach. Now, it may be different. That just seemed to us to be a pretty reasonable approach. If none were paid, the former Attorney General, the present Treasurer, wouldn't report them.

AN HON. MEMBER: You still haven't read them to see whether [inaudible].

[The amendment was defeated.]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we'd like the Chair to take a count of the vote. I believe that can be done informally without having to call the Speaker back in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it can.

[The members rose; a voice vote was recorded.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is defeated.

With respect to the amendment brought in by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all have copies of the amendment to Bill 35, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975? Question on the amendment.

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move another amendment to Bill 35. This amendment comes out of the remarks of the hon. Government House Leader. In his introductory remarks, he indicated to the Assembly that the intent of government was to include or have MLAs sit on certain bodies. We feel it is very important that some type of parameter be established so we in the Legislature know what bodies are available for MLAs to sit on, and just what the plans of government are. I believe any body that is established certainly is established by the Legislature. Any changes made in a certain body don't have to come about between sessions of the Legislature. Because of that, we feel that any body upon which an MLA is sitting should be put into legislation. Bill 35 should name which bodies MLAs will be appointed to.

So I'd like to move an amendment to Section 2, clause (e), and amend it by striking out all the words after the word "person", and substituting the following words:

who is a member at the nomination of the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the following:

- (i) the Alberta Resources Railway
- (ii) the Alberta Research Council
- (iii) the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission
- (iv) the Alberta Hospital Commission
- (v) the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission

We feel it's very significant that these be listed in the legislation, so the members of this Legislature and the general public know the bodies that are available for these kinds of appointments.

Mr. Chairman, I so move that amendment.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think my remarks in opening the second reading of the bill indicated some of the examples, insofar as they were requested, of what boards and commissions to which the government might appoint MLAs. The members of the Assembly and those in the opposition who wish to narrow the bill somewhat should look at Section 10,

where in fact the government has, in proposing the bill in its present form, narrowed it very substantially and reduced very substantially the discretion of the Executive Council, by listing on the bottom of page 1 and on page 2 a large number of boards to which it would not be possible for members to be appointed. In my view, having made that one restriction and set forth a very strict guideline within the bill itself, it would be inappropriate to further limit the discretion with regard to those other examples of boards and commissions to which MLAs should be appointed.

MR. TRYNCHY: Speaking against the motion, Mr. Chairman. The reason is that the last four years the present Minister of Agriculture sat on the grain commission and I think the knowledge he obtained while a member of that commission is very valuable to him as a minister now. The answers he has provided to questions we have had in the House in regard to agriculture have proven this. Now if we limit the commissions or the boards the members sit on to these five, there will be a number of them we eliminate because of this amendment.

I don't think we should have our hands tied to this position. The government has ample room to move and put members where they think they can do the most good. I still believe this should be that way. There's an old philosophy which I still believe in -- going back to the original motion that was defeated -- that we should pay a full day's pay for a full day's work.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as a result of the comments of the hon. Member for Whitecourt, I'd like to pose a question to the Government House Leader. In appointing members to boards and commissions, is it the intention of the government to include the appointment of cabinet ministers and have them paid fees and commissions in addition?

MR. HYNDMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, certainly not. On a number of boards, for example the Alberta Research Council, there are now a number of ministers on the board. They are not paid anything extra. It would be seen by this amendment that the Alberta Research Council membership might well have three ministers deleted and replaced by members of the Legislative Assembly. But certainly, there would be no extra fees in any way, shape, or form paid to ministers.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in closing the debate on this particular item, I feel that certainly more consideration should be given to the amendment than has been. The fact that the list we have placed here is the list outlined by the House leader certainly doesn't mean that if other key, important, areas or boards or commissions -- if you wish to list them in this bill, it can be done today, or in the fall if we wish to add more to it, by a simple amendment in the House. A bill is brought before the House; we discuss the matter at that point in time, and we can add to it.

These boards are not created overnight. I certainly hope they're not, because a board is a very, very significant thing in the process of administering law in this province. When we put them together, at that time we can decide whether an MLA sits on the board. Existing boards and commissions can be considered today; if not, in the fall. I don't think anything very significant will happen between now and the fall as to whether an MLA is sitting on it or not.

I think this is at least a more responsible approach, to take it and handle it in this manner. But to leave it on an open basis, a rather indiscriminate basis, is just not responsible, Mr. Chairman. I feel more consideration should be given by the House leader to this matter. Certainly the power is there to vote us down and to ignore it, but I feel strongly that there is some validity to the suggestion we're making. It is not taking away from the thing the government wants to do; but it is certainly putting it down on paper and clearly outlining the program of MLAs on boards or commissions that they wish to proceed with.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two in connection with the amendment. I believe the amendment recognizes or endorses the principle embodied in the bill, and then restricts its application to certain commissions or boards within the province.

I'm just wondering how sound that principle is. If we're recognizing the principle that the representative of the people can serve a good purpose by being on a commission or a board, then I question whether we should then restrict the authority of the government to name people to such boards and commissions.

I personally feel that an amendment, if it is necessary, would restrict the appointment of an MLA to a board where there's a conflict of interest -- where that member is dealing with money matters in which an MLA might be directly connected, or in which one of his constituents might have a direct interest. I think there would be some danger there. I wouldn't even be in favor of that type of amendment, because the government is elected to govern and must take responsibility for its actions. If the government appoints someone to a board where there's a conflict of interest, the government will have to take the lumps.

If the government is given the authority to appoint an MLA to a commission or board, I think the government should have the responsibility of appointing an MLA to any board or commission where it feels the function, the liaison, the public relations, and the operation can be improved through the appointment of an elected representative who must answer directly to the people. I don't think we're wise in trying to restrict that to

certain boards, because as sure as we do we're going to leave out the very board where perhaps the most urgent need is evident.

So I would oppose the motion on the basis that the bill is giving the government certain authority, then we're restricting it without any idea of looking over all the boards. There are scores of these boards. I wouldn't be prepared to say right now which one I would choose, if I had the choosing. I'm not even sure the government, at this stage, has every board in mind or has reviewed every board where it thinks an MLA is necessary to preserve the public interest, to keep contact with the people. On those grounds, Mr. Chairman, I would oppose the amendment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, while I respect the comments of the hon. Member for Drumheller, it seems to me that really the reverse is the case. I don't really believe this Assembly should be passing a carte blanche principle here which can be applied any way the Executive Council chooses. It seems to me that, as members of the Assembly, if there is merit in our minds to have elected members on various boards, it is abdicating our responsibility not to formally designate those boards.

As the Member for Little Bow has pointed out, it's hardly a big or difficult thing. If the government feels, in its wisdom, that there are two or three or four additional boards in the fall -- or perhaps half a dozen -- where the public interest would be served by having a member appointed, then it is a simple matter to introduce an amendment to this legislation and add the numbers of boards where members can serve.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if we are committed to the concept of Legislative supremacy, and I'm sure we all are, our responsibility as legislators is to look at every case, case by case. I think our job on the opposition is to ask the government to convince us, by argument, case by case, that there is a reason for the appointment of an elected member to each particular board which they propose should have one.

I am very concerned about the idea of just passing carte blanche legislation which allows Executive Council the right of appointment. I think that's delegating authority which should be held very jealously by the members of the Legislature. Delegating it to Executive Council -- I think that's very unfortunate. For those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment, and I hope the government seriously considers it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the debate, but I think one very important point has been forgotten in the comments by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. That is, the government has been elected to govern. The people had their choice between various parties, and they chose the present government. I believe the Legislature should not decide to make the decisions for that government. That government is responsible to this Legislature for the decisions it makes, but it's certainly not the responsibility of the Legislature to make the decisions for the government.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in making one or two comments with regard to the amendment, I certainly hope one of the responsibilities I have in this Legislature, along with every other member, is to give direction to the cabinet.

We passed a number of acts in this Assembly, acts which gave new powers and new directions to a number of ministers in the Assembly. We have asked them to take that responsibility this summer, to get their departments on the road, to start new directions, to bring out new programs. As legislators, we have asked them to do that. They are taking the responsibility we have placed before them, and for that responsibility we are paying them extra remuneration as men and women. That's fine, and that's the way it is.

As backbenchers, we can go back to other ways of life and take on other responsibilities. We're not full-time MLAs. The key thing in what I am saying is that as legislators, as MLAs who have been elected, we have given them powers to go out to work and be responsible in those powers. These men sitting in the front row happen to have been chosen by the Premier. That makes those men in no way superior to the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood or any other person who sits in this Legislature. A special responsibility [has been] assigned to them through legislation of this Assembly. I think it is very, very sad when we hear that the government can go ahead and do whatever they want and are not answerable to this Legislature. That is point number one that I am very unhappy about.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. No one ever said that. I said they are responsible, that the Legislature is not responsible for making the decisions of the government, but the government is responsible to the Legislature for the decisions it makes. That's democracy as it has grown through the mother parliament.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That may be true, Mr. Chairman, but those decisions they make are based on the decisions which are first made in this Assembly. That's the significant thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's the first point, Mr. Chairman.

I think the second thing we have to recognize is that over a period of time, as I've made earlier, in appointment of people to boards and giving people responsibility, the interpretation of legislation does change. Even the attitudes of people who have sat in this Legislature for a number of years change over a period of time. Often that is demonstrated by long-term members. I think we have to recognize that fact. What we're

saying in this amendment is that we are setting the ground rules for ministers or the Premier to administer in this province and take responsibilities. That is what we're attempting to do here.

[The amendment was defeated.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you wish to call for a standing vote again? Fine.

[The members rose; a voice vote was recorded.]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The amendment is defeated.

AN HON. MEMBER: Real close.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment or two. In taking part in this debate, I would like to say that, first of all, a bill like this would never come to this Assembly if there were 40 members on the government side and 35 on the opposition side. To me, Mr. Chairman, as a layman not involved in politics . . .

[laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: Who are you [inaudible] Walter?

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you say "lame"?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, as a layman who was not interested in politics before I got involved in this process, I was appalled at the large majorities of the one-time Premier of this province, Premier Manning. I am more appalled at the large majority the present Premier has. At one time we had a benevolent dictatorship; now we just have a plain dictatorship. There is quite a difference between the two.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, we would not be voting on this bill. I want the hon. members on both sides of the House to think deeply on this. This bill would never be presented if there were 40 on the government side and 35 on the opposition side, Mr. Chairman, because I do not think any government would have the nerve to bring legislation like this before this Assembly. It is not legislation the people of this province would want. There was no bill before the electorate. On March 26 there was no legislation such as this . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Got that in their program.

DR. BUCK: We did not go to the polls saying we would endorse legislation like this.

I was very, very distressed, and I hope it was nothing but a rumor that came out saying that some of the members who had never sat even one day in this Legislature were already complaining about the low indemnity they were going to receive. As I say, I'm sure that was a rumor with no foundation. I hope that is what it was.

AN HON. MEMBER: One of your boys said it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, this bill will be setting up a mechanism which will place some lack of credibility on the members who sit in this House, rightly or wrongly. When we set up legislation in this House which will enable us to be appointed to boards and commissions set up by this Assembly, there is only one term the man in the street can understand, and that is, pork barrel. The man on the street can understand that. Because we've gone through the Watergate turmoil, politicians are not held in very high esteem at this point in time. [interjections] Fine. The hon. members in the back benches can laugh.

AN HON. MEMBER: Coattail brigade.

DR. BUCK: But that's one of the facts of life. If the members have not heard this, they're not listening to what the people out in the grass roots are saying. Watergate shook the credibility of the political system. We see charges and counter-charges in the federal House with one prominent cabinet minister involved and hearings going on. Mr. Chairman, I don't think this government is going to cover itself with roses when it brings in legislation such as this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move an amendment. I feel this is one amendment that has some hope of getting through. [interjection] Mr. Chairman, I would like to amend the bill. Hereby Section 3 is amended by adding at the end of the proposed subsection (4) the following subsection, (5):

Members who are appointed to a board, commission, or other body pursuant to Section 2, clause (a), shall table in the Assembly each year a report on their activities in such appointment during the previous year, and such report shall include a statement of the amount of time spent by the member in carrying out the duties of such appointment.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I'd like to express my concern about that kind of amendment. I was on a commission, and I found the greatest use that I could be was to function as nearly as I could in the role of any responsible citizen placed on that commission. I would suggest that the kind of amendment being proposed here would be

totally destructive of that concept. Mr. Chairman, the general principle here has been debated wide, large, and long. I don't want to get into it except to say, again, that as far as I'm concerned that would make the appointment quite unlike anything I believe was contemplated -- would make the appointee quite different from the balance of the commissioners. I think it would be destructive of the whole exercise.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, as I read the amendment very quickly, all it is suggesting is that if members of this Legislature are going to be appointed to boards, commissions or other bodies under the terms of Bill 35, as a total Assembly we believe a report of their activities and a statement of their remuneration is called for.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that is a reasonable proposition to put forward, and one which is totally consistent with the principle of accountability. After all, Mr. Chairman, when certain members of the Assembly are delegated to serve on boards presumably in the public interest, on the basis of a bill passed by the Assembly; it should also be in the public interest that their reports and the information they can bring be tabled in the Legislature so all the members of the Legislature will have whatever benefits there are to be gained as a result of these appointments.

Mr. Chairman, I believe all this amendment does is to try, in fact, to ensure a minimum amount of accountability, albeit accountability after the fact. It doesn't, in my judgment, make a bad bill a good bill, but at least it mitigates some of the problems I think Albertans see in the principle of Bill 35. Again, it's a very simple, straightforward amendment. I plan to support it.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, speaking to this motion, I would oppose this amendment, because if you look at Section 4 on page 5, (a) and (b), and read through it, it outlines exactly what the boards have to do. They have to report to this Legislature, and they have to report the member who sat on that board and everything else. Why would we pick out one member of a board and have him or her report separately, and not the rest of the board?

MR. CLARK: Because he's an MLA.

MR. TRYNCHY: Doesn't matter. They're members of a board, and if an MLA is a member of a board, he's equal to the board member he's replacing.

DR. BUCK: No, he is not.

MR. TRYNCHY: So to say that one member is different from another is discriminatory, and I would vote against this.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to reinforce what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said about accountability, even though it is after the fact. There is going to be an expenditure of public funds. Because there's going to be an expenditure of public funds, that MLA should report to this House his responsibilities, and what he has done. If we are going to vote, in all conscience, to give this committee or this member funds, we have to know what he has done to earn those funds. I think that is only responsible, because we are entrusted to spend the taxpayers' money. If the hon. members of the back bench want to spend their own money, they don't have to report to anybody. That's their business and their prerogative. But when we are asked to vote on how public funds are being spent, it is incumbent upon this Legislature to have a report on those funds.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the government members to let their consciences indicate to them that moneys being spent by this Legislature should be accounted for.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, with due respect, under section (b) -- and I'd like to read this for the benefit of the hon. member -- it says, and I quote:

. . . . amounts paid in [the] fiscal year by the Government as fees and as travelling and living expenses under this section in respect of each member of the Assembly and the persons to whom and when these amounts were paid.

It's all there. Each member's name is mentioned, the amount he received, and everything. The general report will outline to the Legislature just what the committee has done. Why each member has to say, this is what I've done as a board member, but the other six board members did something else -- I don't believe in that. As a board they should report as a whole, and the names and the amounts are there.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, it's quite obvious that the hon. member has missed the point entirely.

AN HON. MEMBER: As usual.

DR. BUCK: The amounts paid -- we can understand that. Even the hon. Member for Whitecourt can understand that -- travelling expenses, fees. But what he has done on that board is what we want him to report to the Legislature. It's just that plain and simple.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, the basic defect in the amendment is that it is superfluous, because there will be at least seven occasions on which a member in this Assembly can report in the form of a vehicle of a debate on a motion or a bill. Undoubtedly the member will wish to do that in terms of his or her activities on such a board. There is the

opportunity of the throne speech, the budget, in Committee of Supply, on committee study of bills, in the committee on public accounts, in private members' resolutions, and public bills by private members.

It seems to me the MLA who has had the opportunity and benefit of being on one of these boards and commissions can offer to the Assembly, and will want to offer to the Assembly, information as to what the board is doing and the extent to which the board is carrying forth the legislation. So there are many, many opportunities. Essentially, the problem is that the amendment is superfluous.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Chairman, in the mind of the House leader certainly the amendment may be superfluous. But I think if we look at past performance as a precedent for this particular thing -- the opportunity was available for the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place to make a report to the Assembly when he was sitting on the Hospital Commission. Certainly the member did enter into debate and place some of that experience here in this Assembly when we discussed certain things -- in the nursing home area I think, and one other one. But he didn't report specifically on the duties, the things he did -- the amount of travel, things like this, which we feel are relevant and significant. What this particular amendment does is say that we wish the member to report specifically to the Legislature.

If the member carries out his duties responsibly, which I'm sure he will do, I think it would be to his benefit to report to the Legislature that he or she has done a good job, or has learned these things and has promoted this kind of policy. That's number one. Number two, even more important to the member, is that it protects him against any kind of innuendo, or verbalization from within or without this Assembly about what he did.

I'm sure the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place did a good job. He's a very responsible person and attempted, in all his wisdom, to do everything he could. But what recognition have we really given in this Assembly to the particular job he has done? How aware are we of the job that was done? We haven't had a formal report of any kind in the Assembly.

We are saying that that member, because he is a member of the Legislature and does possibly leave himself open to criticism, should have this access to the Legislature in reporting. When we put it in the legislation, saying he will do it, or must do it, he does it without hesitation and without the feeling that, here I am trying to blow my horn about the great things I have done. It can be done with an air of modesty in procedure, rather than any other kind of procedure.

MR. MUSGREAVE: If we support this amendment, we are saying, in effect, we can't trust you to perform the obligations to which you are elected as an MLA. I would suggest to you that perhaps you should go back to your constituents and tell them about the amount of time you've spent with the press, how many times you weren't here, how many committee meetings you missed -- some government members have done the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Address the Chair, please.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman.

I think, to carry this to its logical conclusion, every board member of every agency and commission should come here and tell you how many cups of coffee he had at his meeting, and how much chit-chat he engaged in. Really what we want to know is the kind of decisions they make, if they are made in a wise manner after careful debate. When I sit here and listen to the drivel I've had to listen to this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, I find it a disservice to the people of Alberta to think we are drawing the kind of salaries we are and engaging in the kind of conversations we are. For what purpose? I ask the hon. members of the opposition, for what purpose?

I have served as a board member for several years. While I was a member, I was not paid. I accepted my responsibilities in that area, Mr. Chairman, as an integral part of that board. As part of the board, I was responsible for the decisions that were made, whether I supported them or not. I was part of that board. What that board was doing, what operation was developing from it, was quite obvious to the public by the press reports of those who participated, what debate went on, and what decisions were made. Anybody who was really concerned could easily have assessed whether that particular member had done a good job. He didn't have to run back and say, well, I attended six meetings, and I paid attention to the chairman, and I didn't fall asleep. This is the kind of reporting the hon. members are suggesting by this amendment, and I think it's a disservice to this Assembly that they would even suggest it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, it's just absolute nonsense to suggest that is the purport of this amendment. We have all kinds of reports right now prepared by various boards and departments, which are tabled in the Assembly, Mr. Chairman. Certainly, when the Minister of Education or the Minister of Agriculture or any of the ministers file their annual reports, we hardly check on coffee breaks. It's just not the practice.

I think this amendment is designed to ensure that there be a report in the Assembly of the activities of the member, the major decisions discussed, so we, as members of the Legislature, can assess the work that individual member has done. Certainly there is no inference or suggestion that we want a detailed, blow-by-blow account. That's stretching the definition of the word "report" rather a long way, Mr. Chairman.

Responding to the hon. Government House Leader, he is quite correct when he suggests there are seven occasions when members on boards can get up and contribute to the proceedings of the House. The distinction, and I think it's an important distinction, Mr. Chairman, is whether someone we are allowing to be appointed and paid as a result of Bill 35 should have the discretion or, in fact, be obliged to report. It's fine to say, well, the hon. members can take part in the debate when they are moved to do so. The example was cited of the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, who made a contribution to the nursing home debate. Well and fine. But it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to accept the principle of members of this Legislature being appointed to boards and being paid for their work, as members of the Legislature, we have a right to assess their report.

After all, what is the point of appointing MLAs if you are just going to have representatives of the public who are not responsible to this body? Just appoint members of the public. You don't need to appoint MLAs. If you are going to gain that much by appointing MLAs, Mr. Chairman, it's not just the question of what the MLAs can give to the board in experience. Going back to Mr. Camp's report, he has many doubts about just how much advantage that is; but I won't drag in the Camp report again, because we've already discussed it. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that they are still members of this Legislature and, in my view anyway, if they are going to be appointed and paid, they must be accountable.

This amendment is not asking too much, Mr. Chairman. As I see it, all it is doing is asking for reasonable accountability, and that surely isn't too much to ask.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that this amendment is asking for unreasonable accountability. It denies the basic essence of a board, commission, or group which makes a collective decision. Several hon. members here have very expressly stated that the member would report on his activities. In fact, the member cannot report on his activities; the member would have to report on the collective decision taken. Otherwise, he or she would be destructive of whatever board or body she's representing.

I say again, this strikes the very essence of what a board or commission, as opposed to an individual, is doing. I would say, if we are going to get into this, we better start requiring all members to report to the House when they appear before a board or commission on behalf of constituents. It's about that sensible, maybe even less sensible than that. I think what we have here is an amendment which, I reiterate, strikes at the basis of the whole proposal we have before us.

[The amendment was defeated.]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, we don't plan to move any more amendments to The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975. On second reading, we voted against the bill. We tried to bring in three amendments: one removing the fees the members of the Legislature would get; secondly, specifying the agencies which members could be appointed to; thirdly, building in more accountability.

We don't like the legislation in principle. Through these three amendments, we tried to make the legislation somewhat more acceptable. Naturally, we are disappointed at the lack of success we've had.

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be reported with government amendments.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill 31 The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1975

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 31, The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1975, be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill 33 The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1975

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MISS HUNLEY: I move the bill be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move we rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[The motion was carried.]

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 31 and 33, and begs to report the same. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill No. 35, begs to report the same with some amendments, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill 25 The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1975

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1975. I want to call to the members' attention that some amendments have been distributed. They are of a technical nature, designed to correct some imperfections in the wording of the original bill.

Speaking to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, I wish to restrict my remarks, because the bill really incorporates matters that have been debated in the House at some length during the course of the budget debate in February, the recent budget debate, and the discussion on ALPEP. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides for the 10-point reduction in the personal Alberta income tax, and also for a selective personal income tax reduction for all Alberta taxpayers, individuals that is, with a taxable income of less than \$4,000 and eliminates the Alberta personal income tax entirely from those with a taxable income of less than \$1,400. The reason, Mr. Speaker, for the graduated scale with respect to the taxable income between \$1,400 and \$4,000 is simply to avoid a sharp jump from where one pays no provincial income tax to the income tax level one pays on a taxable income of \$4,000.

The other two major sections of the bill, Mr. Speaker, implement two of the important parts of the ALPEP program. The first is the refunding of that portion of the provincial income tax which becomes payable as a result of non-deductibility of royalties. The second provides for refunds and credits to smaller explorers. It has a ceiling, in the case of corporations, of \$1 million with respect to that portion of the federal income tax payable as a result of non-deductibility of royalties.

The significant change in this bill from the similar bill introduced by my predecessor earlier in the year is that both of those aspects of the ALPEP program are now made applicable to individuals as well as corporations. With respect to individuals, the ceiling that compares to the \$1 million ceiling for the corporations is \$25,000.

The other provisions of the bill, Mr. Speaker, deal with the foreign tax credit and instalment payments. Pursuant to the provisions of the tax collection agreement we have with the federal government, they were introduced here at the request of the federal government to bring our income tax provisions into line or conformity with the similar federal income tax provisions enacted last fall.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the bill undoubtedly will be wholeheartedly supported by the people of Alberta. I urge the members of the Assembly to support it also.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to address a few brief comments to the principle of the bill before us, I would have to say what I've said before in dealing with tax reduction. The problem with an across-the-board tax reduction such as we have in this bill is that the high-income people are going to get quite a bonanza, while on the other hand low-income people will receive a very, very small benefit. Admittedly, as the Provincial Treasurer has pointed out, there is some allowance for adjustment. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the bill in total, the major beneficiaries of this bill are going to be people at the upper income level.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is in direct contrast to one of the important principles contained in the federal budget brought down the other day. Hon. members will be aware that total taxes of people earning \$25,000 and more a year will go up as a result of the new budget. I think that's reasoned on the basis that if we're going to try to fight inflation, high-income people should start. They're best able to bear the brunt of fighting inflation, and therefore are hardly in a position to merit or deserve substantial tax breaks. As things stand in this bill, a person earning \$50,000, \$75,000, or \$100,000 a year is indeed going to be very thankful to the provincial government for a bonanza in a tax cut.

I suggest, as I've said before, that a better and a more equitable route would have been a tax credit approach, which could be applied to people who had incomes less than the taxable minimum. It could have been a direct cash grant, and the same amount would have been available to every Alberta citizen, whether that's \$125, \$150, whatever the equivalent works out to.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address a comment or two to the principle of the excise tax, which is at least indirectly related to the bill we have before us. We've been told by the hon. Premier that the government does not propose to deal with shielding Alberta consumers from the impact of the recent 10 cent per gallon excise tax. I find the argument presented in the Legislature for not doing so a little difficult to follow, Mr. Speaker, because we already have the principle of ALPEP established in this bill. What is the plan? Part of the plan, Mr. Speaker, is to make provincial funds available -- I believe the second or third proposal, a refund of tax on royalties, which is a direct response of the Government of Alberta to the tax changes announced first in the May 1974 budget and later in the November budget.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's a little difficult to argue that we can make remedial policies applicable to the oil companies, yet not make them applicable to the motoring public in the Province of Alberta. I'm going to say a little more about the excise tax in a moment. But it seems to me that argument that they are two different things just doesn't stand up. The precedent has been set, Mr. Speaker. Because we had an industry which, in the government's judgment, was adversely affected by federal taxation measures, ALPEP is going to reduce the income of the Province of Alberta very substantially.

If that can be done for the oil industry, Mr. Speaker, I just don't accept the argument that it can't be done for consumers. There are probably other reasons the Alberta government should not refund the excise tax, but not the reasons which have been presented in this Legislature in the question period.

I want to suggest that the imposition of the excise tax by the federal government is a clear invasion of provincial jurisdiction. It's in effect moving to force provincial governments out of the normal provincial gasoline tax which they've held as their jurisdictional responsibility for years. The reason I would quarrel with the province taking off the 10 cents to make up for the excise tax is that we would simply be surrendering to Ottawa 10 cents a gallon on all fuel sold in Alberta, so the federal government could move into what has traditionally been provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, the comment has been made by some that the excise tax might be called a domestic export tax. We've heard in this House that, somehow, it's a better deal than the export tax. I really question that. It is an imposition by Ottawa of a 10 cent tax on all the fuel sold in this country. Unlike the export tax, Alberta consumers are not shielded from international prices, but in fact have to pay international prices at the gas pump, even though we get something less than the international price for the oil produced in this province.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with ALPEP, and I raise this because I think it's directly relevant to the bill, the Premier's announcement of December 10 outlined a number of proposals for the Alberta Petroleum Exploration Program. These proposals, Mr. Speaker, amount to a very substantial retreat by the Government of Alberta, a retreat which, in both money given out and money foregone, represents a very large amount indeed. I think it would be important at this time to note the extent of the cost of ALPEP, Mr. Speaker, because the people of this province have to assess the cost and the benefits of this plan. The government's paper says the Alberta portion of the refund of tax on royalties returns approximately \$130 million to the petroleum industry. That's right in the government's own paper.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, we have an offset for increased costs, in effect royalty reductions, from an average rate of 40 per cent to 36 per cent. Mr. Speaker, a little bit of quick arithmetic on our gross oil production last year will show that that reduction of 4 per cent in a royalty rate doesn't seem like much. But if you apply it to the production of Alberta it comes to about \$200 million in lost revenue. The tax credit for small explorers will cost in the neighborhood of \$60 million. Again, the modification of the natural gas rates doesn't seem like much, Mr. Speaker. But when you apply it to the production of natural gas in this province and the new average price of 97 cents, which the Premier told us about the other night, that will cost \$75 million.

The fifth portion is the existing exploration and drilling incentive scheme being expanded. It's difficult to estimate what that will in fact cost. The final point, Mr. Speaker, is the royalty rate reduction on the higher price. As most hon. members know, the current surcharge is 65 per cent. The Minister of Energy indicated the other day in the House that he was going to recommend that that be reduced to 50 per cent. Again, Mr. Speaker, if you apply that to the projected 1975-76 production, we're looking at a loss of approximately \$150 million. Taken in total, Mr. Speaker, ALPEP is going to represent a very sizable concession by this government, at least in funds foregone.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the minister, when he concludes the debate, to advise the Assembly what modifications the government is considering in ALPEP. Reading over the release of December 10, Mr. Speaker, we were told throughout that the reason these proposals had to be made, the reason the modifications had to come in, the reason for ALPEP, rested with the federal government's moves of May and November.

The other day in the House the Premier talked about the great triumph -- a rather questionable triumph, I suggest, Mr. Speaker -- and the new deal as a result of the federal budget. One has to ask, if this budget is so good, clearly some of the provisions of ALPEP should be changed. If the federal government has retreated from its former

position, at the very least ALPEP should be modified to show that retreat. But today in question period, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Energy indicated that whatever modifications are planned by the government are going to be very minor indeed.

Mr. Speaker, it's one thing to stimulate the industry, but the argument used in the fall was that this kind of policy was needed to stimulate the industry because of a budget situation. Then we heard the other day that the federal government has substantially changed the rules of the game in such a way that the oil industry will benefit. We had government members standing up and telling us what great strides had been made in changing Ottawa's mind, and in changing the structure of the federal budget. Mr. Speaker, surely if that's true we can expect some substantial changes in this plan so that the loss to the treasury will not be as great. Either that, Mr. Speaker, or the government will in fact be making an admission to the House that when the royalty surcharge was announced in April 1974 -- when we again had all the members banging their desks with great glee at the 65 per cent surcharge -- the government miscalculated and itself contributed to a problem it is now trying to adjust and to rectify.

Mr. Speaker, for those reasons I believe this bill we are dealing with today is rather important. I would hope it would merit substantial debate on both sides of the House. I am not opposed to making additional funds available to the oil industry, but as I look over ALPEP, I see a very large percentage of that money is going to the larger companies. As I see it, if funds are going to be made available to the industry as an incentive to drill, we should, as much as possible, tie that incentive directly to number three, which is a tax credit plan for small explorers, as well as expanding the existing drilling incentive scheme; so we are tying our subsidies or our assistance, rebates, or whatever you want to call it, to actual work done, actual footage drilled; so we are not inadvertently giving a bonanza in concessions to companies which are not really doing the job in the Province of Alberta at this time.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the hon. Provincial Treasurer to advise us very clearly as to where the energy committee, which he chairs, stands at this point in time. In terms of reviewing ALPEP, what changes and modifications of a material nature are they prepared to recommend?

In conclusion, I simply make the plea again, if we are going to talk about tax reduction in the future -- nobody likes to argue against tax reduction, it's like shooting Santa Claus. But in looking at tax reduction, I think we have a responsibility to see that that tax reduction is done in the fairest possible way, so the maximum benefits go to people who most need it. Higher income people, including some of the MLAs who are now going to be on boards and commissions, can well take a little time to worry about the problems of inflation. You know, they can deal with it. I think that's the thrust of the federal budget. But our efforts should be focussed on making money available to low-income people, including those, Mr. Minister, who are not in a position to pay on any taxable income at all, and who will not benefit under this scheme. So I think, Mr. Speaker, when we look at tax reduction, it's not only good enough to talk about amounts of money involved, but I think we have to look just as carefully, and just as clearly, at the equity in tax reduction. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that is the most important aspect of any tax reduction proposal made in this or any other House.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two comments in connection with the bill. In spite of all the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has said, I support the principle of this bill because it will leave more money in the pockets of the people of this province. When we have a competitive profit system, people invest money to make a profit. It is not a sin to make a profit. If it hadn't been for the profit motive in this country and in this province, we would not have the high standard of living we have today. Sometimes I wish the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview would remember that.

People invest their money for the purpose of making a profit. We work for the purpose of making a profit. When taxation reaches the level that it takes so much off your take-home pay, whether it's from interest or from hard, backbone work, it's discouraging. People are inclined to say, we'll go on unemployment insurance. We'll go on welfare. We won't bother working. Industry is inclined to say, if they're not making a return, we'll fold up. What kind of country are we going to have if we have that type of thing? Unless we want the government to finance everything. Well, I don't want that kind of system. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview might, but I don't. I believe in competition. When we have competition, there's no better way of getting the best possible price for the people. Competition is the lifeblood of free enterprise. Without competition, of course, you introduce those monopolistic features, whether by private industry or by government.

The thing I like about the bill is that this is going to provide a greater incentive for people to work, because a government is not going to take so much as they have been taking. I'd like to see the result more than 10 points. But, at the same time, 10 points is going to be a good incentive for people to continue to work. It's going to leave some millions of dollars in the pockets of the people of this province, which otherwise would have gone into the coffers of the government. I support this type of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate I'll address my comments to the arguments advanced by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I must say, he delivers his arguments in a very admirable style. My only regret, whenever I'm listening to him, is that the substance of the arguments never matches the style in which they're delivered.

I'm not going to spend very much time on his argument with respect to the inequities of an income tax reduction, except to say this, Mr. Speaker. First of all, we do have a selective element in the income tax reduction which is applicable to the people with lower taxable incomes. I pointed that out in moving second reading of the bill. Also, one who argues the way the hon. member did is, I think, afflicted with tunnel vision, because he looks at only one program of the government.

If the hon. member spread his view over the entire government operation, which I suggest he ought to do more frequently, he'd find a great number of programs this government has developed specifically to help those people with lower incomes. I think of the mass of senior citizen programs which have been introduced in recent years, in the fees under medicare, and a number of areas where this government has expressed in a very meaningful way its very deep concern for those people in Alberta who are on lower incomes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to his comments about those aspects of the bill dealing with ALPEP. He talked about the principle of shielding the residents of Alberta from a federal tax. The answer to that question, asked earlier in the House today of the Premier, was given. He says the answer isn't accurate, because we've already established the precedent in refunding, under the small explorer portion of ALPEP, the parts of the federal tax payable as a result of the non-deductibility of royalties.

I want to call to the House's attention, in particular to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview's attention, that there is a very, very fundamental distinction between shielding with respect to an excise tax and making adjustments with respect to non-deductibility of royalties. The very fundamental distinction is simply that: in the one case the relationship between the government and the people benefiting from that program is the relationship of owner and lessee. We have a business relationship with them, which is entirely different from the relationship between the government and the people paying the excise tax. The two are just not equal in principle.

The other point the hon. member made, when he was talking about the costs of ALPEP, was that there was a massive return to the petroleum industry. But I simply want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the portion of ALPEP to which that remark was directed by the hon. member is the returning, if you like, of that portion of the provincial income tax which is collected as a result of the federal government decision respecting deductibility. The very simple position with that, Mr. Speaker, is this: the provincial government assessed the viability of the industry, assessed the level it thought the industry could pay in royalties and still be a viable industry. Having made that assessment, in short having decided what would be equitable for the people of Alberta and a fair return for their ownership interest that should be paid by the petroleum industry; the action of the federal government, unasked for and opposed by this government, resulted in a large sum of additional funds flowing to the government out of that industry.

All that's been done with that part of the program is to say, in our assessment of the industry's capacity to pay it, it couldn't have paid it, we didn't want to assess it. If we thought it could have, we would have set the royalty rates at a higher level. This money came to us as a result of an action of another government. We felt it was an unduly harsh burden on the industry and have returned it to them. Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member to say that's part of the cost of the ALPEP program is, in my judgment, a gross distortion of the actual situation.

The other aspect of the ALPEP program incorporated in the bill, to which the hon. member referred, was the credit for small explorers. He made an argument that all of these funds were flowing to the large corporations. That, Mr. Speaker, may be true with respect to the portion of the provincial income tax being collected as a result of the federal government action, and I've already dealt with that. It is certainly not true with respect to the remainder of the program dealt with in this bill, because there we have a ceiling on it. So there's no more than a million dollars paid. That excludes all of the big corporations in the province from receiving more than that. The million-dollar ceiling enables us to make those payments to all of the small companies, the ones that are doing the exploration and development work in the province.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I wish to deal with is the hon. member's request for comment on what alterations might be made by the provincial government in its ALPEP program as a result of the recent federal budget. That question, of course, was answered by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources during the question period today.

I do want to correct the hon. member when he referred to me as chairman of the energy committee of cabinet. That's not so. The chairman of the energy committee is the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

I merely confirm, Mr. Speaker, the answer given by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources earlier today, that no changes in the program are contemplated by the provincial government. The reason is very simple. The hon. member argues that if we don't make a change in that program, we're going to admit that we made some mistakes when we initially set the level of royalties, or that this wasn't the victory we've argued it was.

Let me answer the hon. member very simply in this way. What we said after the ALPEP program was announced in December was that: the oil industry has been treated too harshly by the federal government's earlier budgets. We are going to provide some relief, in the way we did in the ALPEP program. But we took a very important further step. We called on the federal government to provide some further relief. The federal government has done

that in this recent budget. That's what has occurred. The hon. member cannot validly argue from what happened in the federal budget on Monday of this week either that this government's original decisions about royalties were too high, or that there wasn't a major step forward in our dealings with the federal government, to have them acknowledge the necessity of changing the principle of deductibility the way they did.

In resume in these areas, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that the fundamental policy of this government has been to obtain for the Province of Alberta a fair and equitable return for their ownership interest in petroleum resources. At the same time, we recognize the valuable contributions industry has made and is making to the province and are convinced that royalties, taxation, and what have you, must be set at levels which will enable it to remain a viable, vital industry within the province, not dying, as is happening in some of our sister provinces.

[The motion was carried. Bill 25 was read a second time.]

PRIVATE BILLS
(Second Reading)

Bill Pr. 1 An Act to Amend Certain Settlements
Resulting From The Last Will and Testament of The Honourable Patrick Burns

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Private Bill No. 1 and bring to the attention of hon. members that an amendment has been moved and passed by the private bills committee and circulated in the House.

[The motion was carried. Bill Pr. 1 was read a second time.]

Bill Pr. 2 An Act to Amend The Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970

MR. DCAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Private Bill No. 2, An Act to Amend the Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970.

The principle of this bill is simply that the Alberta Wheat Pool is seeking permission to increase reserves from \$30 to \$50 million. The principal reasons are: the effect inflation has had on the real value of reserves, as well as to represent ownership; also the need for an increase in capital base to provide for expansion or maintenance of Alberta Wheat Pool operations and properties. As well, Mr. Speaker, there is a slight change in the method of returning reserves to membership.

[The motion was carried. Bill Pr. 2 was read a second time.]

Bill Pr. 3 An Act Respecting Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that Private Bill No. 3 be read a second time.

[The motion was carried. Bill Pr. 3 was read a second time.]

Bill Pr. 6 An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Canada West Insurance Company

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Private Bill No. 6.

[The motion was carried. Bill Pr. 6 was read a second time.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE (continued)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

Bill 25 The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1975

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 25 be reported as amended.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill 36 The Common Parties Contracts and Conveyances Amendment Act, 1975

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill Pr. 1 An Act to Amend Certain Settlements
Resulting From The Last Will and Testament of The Honourable Patrick Burns

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 1 be reported as amended.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill Pr. 2 An Act to Amend The Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. DOAN: Mr. Chairman, I move this bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill Pr. 3 An Act Respecting Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe there's one procedural matter with regard to this bill. The committee has recommended that the fees be waived with respect to this private bill. To follow up that recommendation, I believe this committee should approve the recommendation of the private bills committee that fees be waived by the person applying.

HON. MEMEERS: Agreed.

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill Pr. 3 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill Pr. 6 An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate the Canada West Insurance Company

[The title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. ASHTON: I move that the bill be reported, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[The motion was carried.]

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill No. 36 and bills Pr. 2, Pr. 3, Pr. 6, and begs to report same. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill No. 25 and Bill Pr. 1, begs to report same with some amendments, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Third Reading)

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried.]

No.	Name	Moved by
15	The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1975	Russell (for Johnston)
25	The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1975	Leitch

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, just to simplify the procedure with regard to the other third readings, perhaps we could do them in this order. The third readings on the Order Paper are Bills 28, 30, and 34 if we could proceed with those at this time.

At this time, I would like to ask leave, notwithstanding Rule 63, to proceed to third reading with regard to the other bills which we have just completed, bills 31, 33, 35, 36, and Pr. 1, Pr. 2, Pr. 3, and Pr. 6. If we could call them in that order, I believe it would simplify the procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the proposal and request by the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried.]

No.	Name	Moved by
28	The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1975	Russell (for Johnston)
30	The Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Amendment Act, 1975	Leitch
31	The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1975	Purdy

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I move we stop the clock at 5:29.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the motion is passed. The clock will henceforth be invisible to the Speaker until it's brought into view by an appropriate motion.

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried.]

No.	Name	Moved By
33	The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1975	Hunley
34	The Department of Housing and Public Works Act	Yurko

Bill 35 The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 35, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last comment we'd like to make as far as Bill 35 is concerned. We've opposed the bill on principle. We've proposed amendments in committee. I think in fairness to the Assembly, and so it does in fact appear on the record, on behalf of my colleagues, the Member for Little Bow, the Member for Clover Bar, the Member for Bow Valley, and myself, we would refuse to sit on any such committees, if we were asked by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to sit on any of the government agencies or boards.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion carried. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

For the motion:

Adair	Donnelly	Hyndman	Miller	Stewart
Appleby	Farran	Jamison	Miniely	Stromberg
Ashton	Fluker	Kidd	Moore	Taylor
Backus	Getty	King	Musgreave	Thompson
Batiuk	Gogo	Koziak	Paproski	Trynchy
Eradley	Hansen	Krceger	Planche	Walker
Butler	Harle	Kushner	Purdy	Warrack
Chichak	Hohol	Leitch	Russell	Webber
Cookson	Horner	Little	Schmid	Wolstenholme
Crawford	Horsman	Lougheed	Schmidt	Young
Diachuk	Hunley	Lysons	Shaben	Yurko
Doan	Hyland	McCrimmon		

Against the motion:

Buck	Clark	Mandeville	Notley	Speaker, R.
------	-------	------------	--------	-------------

Totals: Ayes -- 58 Noes -- 5]

[The motion was carried. Bill 35 was read a third time.]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried.]

No.	Name	Moved by
36	The Common Parties Contracts and Conveyances Amendment Act, 1975	Hyndman
Pr.1	An Act to Amend Certain Settlements Resulting From The Last Will and Testament of the Honourable Patrick Burns	Horsman (for Gitter)
Pr.2	An Act to Amend the Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970	Doan
Pr.3	An Act Respecting Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation	Horsman (for Gitter)
Pr.6	An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate The Canada West Insurance Company	Ashton

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, His Honor the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

ROYAL ASSENT

[His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Legislative Assembly and took his place upon the Throne.]

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honor, the Legislative Assembly has, at its present sitting, passed certain bills to which, and in the name of the Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honor's assent.

CLERK: Following are the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 1 The District Courts Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 2 The Appropriation Act, 1975
 Bill 4 The Medical Profession Act, 1975
 Bill 5 The Senior Citizens Benefits Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 6 The Department of Advanced Education Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 7 The Department of Manpower and Labour Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 8 The Department of Health and Social Development Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 9 The Hospitals and Medical Care Statutes Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 10 The Irrigation Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 11 The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 12 The Department of Transportation Act
 Bill 13 The Department of Energy and Natural Resources Act
 Bill 14 The Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 15 The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 16 The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Act
 Bill 17 The Department of Consumer Affairs Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 18 The Department of Telephones and Utilities Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 19 The Department of Business Development and Tourism Act
 Bill 20 The Workers' Compensation Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 21 The Unfair Trade Practices Act
 Bill 22 The Cultural Development Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 23 The Financial Administration Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 24 The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 25 The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 26 The Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 27 The Department of Government Services Act
 Bill 28 The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 29 The Pipeline Act, 1975
 Bill 30 The Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 31 The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1975
 Bill 32 The Electoral Boundaries Commission Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 33 The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 34 The Department of Housing and Public Works Act
 Bill 35 The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill 36 The Common Parties Contracts and Conveyances Amendment Act, 1975
 Bill Pr. 1 An Act to Amend Certain Settlements Resulting From The Last Will and Testament of The Honourable Patrick Burns
 Bill Pr. 2 An Act to Amend the Alberta Wheat Pool Act, 1970
 Bill Pr. 3 An Act Respecting Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation
 Bill Pr. 6 An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate the Canada West Insurance Company

[The Lieutenant-Governor indicated his assent.]

CLERK: In Her Majesty's name, His Honor the Honorable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Order.

[The Lieutenant-Governor left the Legislative Assembly.]

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

2. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
 Be it resolved that, when the Assembly adjourns for the summer recess, it shall stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, November 12, 1975.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly do now adjourn for the summer recess.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned in accordance with Government Motion No. 2.

[The House rose at 5:53 p.m.]